

Appl. No. 10/708,373
Amdt. dated Aug. 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 06, 2005

REMARKS

1. Specification objections

- 5 The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
Paragraph [0030], lines 1 and 3, reference number “107” designates both the integrator and the control unit.

Response:

10

The use of both terms “integrator” and “control unit” were incorrect as the integrator and the control unit are the same device. With this in mind, the paragraphs [0030] and [0013] have been amended to correct the typographical errors. No new matter is introduced.

15

In addition, the title was amended to delete the article included as the first word of the original title to comply with patent application requirements. No new matter is introduced.

20

2. Claim objections

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- 25 In line 11, it is suggested that “second delay line” be changed to —second delay chain—to be consistent with “a first delay chain” in line 3.

Response:

Appl. No. 10/708,373
Amdt. dated Aug. 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 06, 2005

Claim 14 was objected to because there was inconsistency in the wording. Claim 14 has been amended accordingly. No new matter is introduced.

5

3. Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1–8, and 14–15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention.

10

Response:

As mentioned above, the use of both terms “integrator” and “control unit” were incorrect as the integrator and the control unit are the same device. The typographical errors in the 15 claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 have been corrected accordingly. No new matter is introduced.

As the Examiner stated in the section “Allowable subject matter” of this office action, claims 1 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, set forth in this office action. Applicant believes 20 that the amended claims 1 and 14 have been placed in condition for allowance. As claims 2–8 and claim 15 are dependent on amended claim 1 and claim 14 respectively, these dependant claims should be allowable if claims 1 and 14 are found allowable.

4. Drawing objections

25

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Appl. No. 10/708,373
Amdt. dated Aug. 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 06, 2005

Response:

As mentioned above, the control unit and the integrator are the same device. Claims 1 and 14 have therefore been altered to only claim the control unit, where the control unit further has functions of the originally claimed integrator. Therefore, every feature of the invention specified in the claims has now been shown in the drawings. The objections under 37 CFR 1.83(a) have therefore been overcome.

- 10 Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Sincerely yours,



Date: August 03, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

- 15 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Faxsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 20 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.).